



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,501	01/06/2004	Guoping Jia	200207061-2	3329

22879 7590 11/06/2007  
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

KANE, CORDELIA P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/06/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

90

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/751,501	Applicant(s) JIA ET AL.	
	Examiner Cordelia Kane	Art Unit 2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed October 1, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regards to the rejections of claims 1, 2, and 6 – 11 in view of Loeb, applicant argues that the end user identity is separate from the end user profile. While the identity is separate from the end user profile it is also associated with it. When identity U needs to update its profile information it passes its identity and its encrypted profile (column 4, lines 8-13). Therefor true identity U is associated with the profile, and is a true profile. Fake identity U' and the doubly encrypted profile are passed together (column 4, lines 26-28). Fake identity U' is associated with the encrypted profile and is therefor a false profile.

2. With regards to the rejection of claims 3 – 5, applicant argues that Herz fails to teach a user side device provided with a true user profile which comprises user related profile data, and a profile generator operable to generate at least one false user profile which includes profile data not the same as the users profile data. However, Loeb is cited as teaching providing a true user profile which comprises user related profile data (column 4, lines 8-13). The true user identity is provided with the user profile and is therefor a true user profile. Loeb also teaches generating a false user profile which includes profile data not the same as the users profile data (column 4, lines 26-28). The

pseudonym is provided with the true user profile. Together they make a false user profile since the identity is not the true user identity.

3. With regards to claims 12 and 15, applicant is claiming transmitting a plurality of fake user profiles. Loeb teaches that there is a plurality of end user stations (column 2, lines 55-56), and therefor a plurality of pseudonyms would be passed when all the stations are functioning at the same time.

4. With regards to claims 13 and 16, applicant is claiming that the false user profile contains at least one item of user identification data and at least one other item of user data. Loeb teaches that the false user profile includes the encrypted user profile and the pseudonym (column 4, lines 26-28). The user profile is the item of user identification and the other data is the pseudonym.

5. With regards to claims 14 and 17, applicant is claiming that the false user profile contains one item of data from a true user profile and at least one item of false data corresponding to a different user field. Loeb teaches that the fake user profile includes the encrypted true profile as well as the fake pseudonym (column 4, lines 26-28).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 1, 2, 6 – 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shoshanna Loeb et al's US Patent 5,245,656.

Art Unit: 2132

8. Referring to claims 1 and 8, Loeb teaches:
  - a. Storing user profile information (column 4, lines 5-13).
  - b. Generating a false user profile (column 4, lines 19-20).
  - c. Transmitting the false user profile to a third party (column 4, lines 47-48) including a data request (column 4, lines 5-6).
  - d. Receiving a response from the third party (column 4, lines 48-49).
  - e. Generating a response based on the true user profile (column 4, lines 53-62).
9. Referring to claims 2 and 9, Loeb teaches:
  - f. Generating an entirely false profile (U') which is not the same as the true user profile (U) (column 4, lines 19-20).
10. Referring to claim 6, it is inherent that receiving the responses would take place over a period of time.
11. Referring to claim 7, Loeb teaches that the profile generator is remote to the user (Figure, 40).
12. Referring to claim 10, Loeb teaches that the network could be a wide area or local area network (column 2, line 29). Thus it is inherent that the end user stations would be a computer.
13. Referring to claim 11, Loeb teaches that the network could be a wide area or local area network (column 2, line 29). Thus it is inherent that the end user stations would include a personal computer, or portable computer.

Art Unit: 2132

14. Referring to claims 12 and 15, Loeb teaches transmitting a plurality of false user profiles to a third party (column 4, lines 26-28). Loeb teaches that there is a plurality of end user stations (column 2, lines 55-56), and therefore a plurality of pseudonyms would be passed when all the stations are functioning at the same time.

15. Referring to claims 13 and 16, Loeb teaches that the false user profile contains at least one item of user identification data ({[PR]}) and at least one other item of user data (U') (column 4, lines 26-28).

16. Referring to claims 14 and 17, Loeb teaches that the false user profile contains at least one item of data from the true user profile ({[PR]}) corresponding to a user field and at least one item of false data (U') corresponding to a different user field (column 4, lines 26-28).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

17. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

18. Claims 3 – 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loeb, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Frederick Herz et al's US Patent 5,754,938.

19. Loeb discloses all the limitations of the parent claim. Loeb does not appear to explicitly disclose using interpolation to determine the appropriate response, or the false user profile being random. However, Herz discloses:

20. That a user has a partial profile made up of different data (column 5, lines 61-62).

21. That the pseudonym or false profile is random (column 36, lines 27-32).
22. That interpolation is the best method to use to estimate a users response (column 19, lines 19-21). Herz does not specifically appear to mention interpolating between two user partial profiles, but it would have been obvious to combine the partial profiles of the same user, as taught by Loeb, with the interpolation of the whole profiles of two different users as taught by Herz to estimate the best value for a response from the partial profiles.
23. Loeb and Herz are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, pseudonyms in electronic transactions. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Loeb and Herz before him or her, to modify Loeb to include the interpolation and random generation of Herz. The motivation for doing so would have been that interpolation is an effective method at estimating values (column 19, lines 12-13).

### ***Conclusion***

24. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2132

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cordelia Kane whose telephone number is 571-272-7771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Cordelia Kane  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2132



GILBERTO BARRON JR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100